## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application. Claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41 are pending in this application.

A review of the claims indicates that:

A)     Claims 24, 26-28, 37, and 39-41 remain in their original form.

B)     No claims are currently amended.

C)     Claims 1-6, 23, 25, 36 and 38 are previously presented.

D)     No claims are currently added.

E)     Claims 7-22, 29-35 and 42-60 are currently cancelled.

Claims 1-6, 23-28 and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Simpson, Mastering WordPerfect® 5.1 & 5.2 For Windows™, 1993, (hereinafter "Simpson") in view of US Patent 5,890,177 to Moody et al. (hereinafter "Moody").

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

### **Telephonic Interview with Examiner**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview on November 29, 2007. In particular, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his provisional indication that the claims listed above distinguish over the combination of Simpson and Moody.

As agreed, Applicant is including arguments discussed during the interview below. Additionally, the Examiner is reminded, as per the Examiner's request, that selected amendments made to claims 1, 23 and 36 in Applicant's previously submitted Office action response recite subject matter which was cited by the

Office in the examiner's statement of reasons for allowance for commonly owned US Patent 7,036,078.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

## Claim 1

Claims 1-6, 23-28 and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Simpson in view of Moody. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Independent claim 1** recites:

> One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed, implement an extensible electronic document editor comprising:
> a selection services component comprising a selection services interface that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension to override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor and provide a customized model for the selection function, and to clear, add or remove a segment from a selection object using the customized model for the selection function;
> a designer extensibility mechanism;
> a plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection services component;
> a designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are arranged in sequential order; and
> an event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer registry.

Moody fails to disclose or show the one or more computer-readable media of claim 1. Rather, Moody describes a document editing system that allows a group of human editors to cooperatively edit a document. (*Moody,* Col. 1, lines 24-28 and Col. 2,

lines 30-34). Under Moody, after an author has created a document, the document is sent to multiple human review editors for comments. (*Moody,* Col. 4, lines 21-32). The document can be sent in a variety of ways including via a local area network, email, or by saving the document to a disk and physically transporting the disk to the editors. (*Moody,* Col. 4, lines 34-37). The order in which the document is sent out to the human review editors, however, is not described in Moody.

Once received, each review editor can edit their copy of the document and create an edited copy. (*Moody,* Col. 4, lines 44-51). These edited copies can be collected by the author and all of the edits from the various edited copies can be consolidated into a final document. (*Moody,* Col. 4, 43-55). The edited copies can be returned to the author in a variety of ways including electronic transmission or saving the document to a disk and returning the disk to the author. (*Moody,* Col. 4, lines 46-51). Moody makes no mention, however, of any mechanism used by the author to collect the edited copies.

Accordingly, Moody fails to disclose, show, teach or suggest elements such as "a designer extensibility mechanism" or "a plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection services component" as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Moody only describes how the copies of the document and edited copies of the document can be sent between the author and the editors (i.e. via a local area network, email, or by saving the document to a disk and physically transporting the disk to the editors). No mention is given in Moody as to any mechanisms used to facilitate such transfers.

Moreover, Moody fails to disclose, show, teach or suggest elements such "a designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are arranged in sequential order" and "an event routing controller adapted to route events to

at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer registry" as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Moody merely describes sending a document to multiple human review editors and allowing them to send back their comments in edited copies. The order in which this is done is not disclosed by Moody.

Simpson adds nothing to the failed teachings of Moody.

This has been acknowledged by the Office on pages 3 and 4 of the current Office action which in which the Office concedes:

> Simpson fails to specifically disclose:
>
> A designer extensibility mechanism
>
> A plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection services component
>
> A designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are arranged in sequential order
>
> An event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer registry

Instead, in rejecting claim 1, the Office relies on Figure 2 and Column 4, lines 20-63 of Moody as disclosing these elements. (*Office Action*, Page 4). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Moody only describes sending multiple copies of an original document to one or more human review editors and consolidating edits made by these

editors into a final document.  Moody makes no mention of any order in which the copies are sent to the editors.  Additionally, Moody makes no mention of any mechanisms used to facilitate transfers between the author and the editors.

Consequently, Moody fails to disclose or show "a designer extensibility mechanism" or "a plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection services component" as recited in claim 1.  Further, Moody fails to disclose or show "a designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are arranged in sequential order" and "an event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer registry" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, since Moody and Simpson, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, show, teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1, the §103(a) anticipation rejection of claim 1 based on Moody and Simpson is not supported.  Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 2-6** are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim.  These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed, shown, taught nor suggested in Moody and Simpson.  Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejection of claims 2-6 be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 23** recites:

> A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for one or more interfaces that, when executed by an extensible electronic document editor on a computer, perform the following:
>
> override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor to provide a customized model for the selection function;
>
> register one or more designers in a sequential order;
>
> route an event to at least one of the one or more designers based at least in part on the sequential order in which the one or more designers are registered;
>
> receive parameters from one of the one or more designers through a selection services interface;
>
> utilize the parameters to clear, add or remove a selected segment from a selection object of an electronic document using the customized model for the selection function;
>
> return values to the designer regarding the state of the selected segment.

For reasons similar to those cited above in conjunction with claim 1, Simpson and Moody, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, show, teach or suggest the computer-readable medium of claim 23.

In rejecting claim 23, the Office concedes on page 6 of the current Office action that:

> Simpson fails to specifically disclose:
>
> A designer extensibility mechanism
>
> A plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection services component
>
> A designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are arranged in sequential order

An event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the
designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer
registry

Rather, the Office relies on Figure 2 and Column 4, lines 20-63 of Moody as disclosing
these elements. (*Office Action*, Page 7). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Moody only describes sending multiple copies of an original
document to one or more human review editors and consolidating edits made by these
editors into a final document. Moody makes no mention of any order in which the copies
are sent to the editors. Nor does Moody describe any mechanism used to facilitate
transfers of documents and edited copies between the author and the editors.

Consequently, Moody fails to disclose or show "register one or more designers in
a sequential order", "route an event to at least one of the one or more designers based at
least in part on the sequential order in which the one or more designers are registered"
and "receive parameters from one of the one or more designers through a selection
services interface" as recited in claim 23.

Accordingly, since Moody and Simpson, either alone or in combination, fail to
disclose, show, teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 23, the §103(a) anticipation
rejection of claim 23 based on Moody and Simpson is not supported. Applicant therefore
respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 24-28** are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable
base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in
combination with those recited in claim 23, are neither disclosed, shown, taught nor
suggested in Moody and Simpson. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the
§103(a) rejection of claims 24-28 be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 36** recites:

> A method for providing selection services to one or more extensions in an extensible editor, the method comprising:
> receiving a request from an extension to utilize a selection services component;
> facilitating the request by presenting a selection services interface that is accessible by the extension and that overrides a selection function provided by the extensible editor to provide a customized model for the selection function;
> registering the one or more extensions in a sequential order;
> routing an event related to the selection services component to at least one of the one or more extensions based at least in part on the sequential order in which the extensions are registered; and
> communicating with the at least one of the one or more extensions through the selection services interface to enable the extension to clear, add, or remove a selected segment from a selection object of an electronic document using the customized model for the selection function.

For reasons similar to those cited above in conjunction with claims 1 and 23, Simpson and Moody, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, show, teach or suggest the method of claim 36.

In rejecting claim 36, the Office relies on the same bases as those used in rejecting claims 1 and 23. (*Office Action*, Page 7). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Moody only describes sending multiple copies of an original document to one or more human review editors and consolidating edits made by these editors into a final document. Moody makes no mention of any order in which the copies are sent to the editors. Nor does Moody describe any mechanism used to facilitate transfers of documents and edited copies between the author and the editors.

Consequently, Moody fails to disclose or show "registering the one or more extensions in a sequential order", "routing an event related to the selection services component to at least one of the one or more extensions based at least in part on the

sequential order in which the extensions are registered" and "communicating with the at least one of the one or more extensions through the selection services interface to enable the extension to clear, add, or remove a selected segment from a selection object of an electronic document using the customized model for the selection function" as recited in claims 36.

Simpson provides none of the teachings missing in Moody.

Accordingly, since Moody and Simpson, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, show, teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 36, the §103(a) anticipation rejection of claim 36 based on Moody and Simpson is not supported. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejection of claim 36 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 37-41** are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 36, are neither disclosed, shown, taught nor suggested in Moody and Simpson. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejection of claims 37-41 be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview.


Respectfully Submitted,


Dated: <u>Jan 22, 2008</u>                   By:    <u>/Jim Patterson/</u>
                                                        Jim Patterson
       Reg. No. 52,103
       Attorney for Applicant

       LEE & HAYES PLLC
       Suite 500
       421 W. Riverside Avenue
       Spokane, Washington 99201
       Telephone: 509-324-9256 x247
       Facsimile: (509) 323-8979